

## Schary, Claire

---

**From:** Bresler, Helen (ECY) <HBRE461@ECY.WA.GOV>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2014 11:15 AM  
**To:** Schary, Claire; Carrie Sanneman; mgil461@ECY.WA.GOV  
**Cc:** Bobby Cochran; Joe Furia; Karin Power; Neil Mullane; Tim Wigington  
**Subject:** RE: 7/17 response to revisions  
**Attachments:** Regional Recommendations for the Pacific Northwest\_2014 07 17\_TW-Claire and hb.docx

Hey,

In looking at Claire's last things, I noticed one more deletion that we need to make that has to do with a state's nonpoint authority. I have edited the language in the document and noted it with a comment. This shouldn't be a big deal because we've all already agreed to the language. My edit and comment are on page 8.

Helen

---

**From:** Schary, Claire [mailto:Schary.Claire@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2014 10:19 AM  
**To:** Bresler, Helen (ECY); Carrie Sanneman; Gildersleeve, Melissa (ECY)  
**Cc:** Bobby Cochran; Joe Furia; Karin Power; Neil Mullane; Tim Wigington  
**Subject:** RE: 7/17 response to revisions

I finished re-reading the comments and edits, and have highlighted in dark pink my new comments. I'm OK with all the changes- just one comment states that the edits didn't answer my question about credit stacking, and I have a suggested addition to another sentence about credit life being limited by some state policy so that the BMPs become part of the baseline (but I didn't insert that suggested language in the document itself – it's only in the highlighted comment).

Hopefully this means we're very close to being done!

-- Claire

**Claire Schary**  
[schary.claire@epa.gov](mailto:schary.claire@epa.gov) / (206) 553-8514

---

**From:** Bresler, Helen (ECY) [mailto:HBRE461@ECY.WA.GOV]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 17, 2014 4:27 PM  
**To:** Carrie Sanneman; Schary, Claire; [mgil461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:mgil461@ECY.WA.GOV)  
**Cc:** Bobby Cochran; Joe Furia; Karin Power; Neil Mullane; Tim Wigington  
**Subject:** RE: 7/17 response to revisions

I'm OK. I think the thing about Claire's comment SC24 was that we were thinking of inserting a new idea that had to do with WA requiring the BMPs that achieve compliance with our no discharge law but then allowing a landowner to trade some of that, but the idea is not fully fleshed out, so Claire and I agreed we don't need to insert anything now, but might want to later. As to the green language there, I do like it in.

Helen

---

**From:** Carrie Sanneman [<mailto:sanneman@willamettepartnership.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 17, 2014 4:15 PM  
**To:** Bresler, Helen (ECY); Schary, Claire; Gildersleeve, Melissa (ECY)  
**Cc:** Bobby Cochran; Joe Furia; Karin Power; Neil Mullane; Tim Wigington  
**Subject:** 7/17 response to revisions

Hi there,

We are so close. Please see the attached version, it only includes the changes made in the last couple days. Once we have agreed, we'll send a compare with all changes since the 6/24 versions to ID and OR, but for now wanted to focus on just those remaining issues.

We accepted everything and made some additions in response to comments or questions. All of the places where we added new text are highlighted in either blue (Tim) or green (WP), same goes for the comments. Where they are UN-highlighted, it means that we OK with the changes. I also tried to put an affirmative "OK" in all of those places.

Let us know what you think!

Carrie